

**REMARKS**

Claims 24 and 25 are pending in the present application.

**Drawings**

Applicants note the Examiner's acceptance of the Replacement Drawing Sheet as filed along with the Amendment dated June 14, 2005.

**Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 112**

Claim 25 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner has asserted that the features "letting data stored in said shift register be written into said reception FIFO circuit, when the second interrupt signal is input thereto" of claim 25 are not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey that Applicants had possession of the claimed invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

As described in paragraph [0026] of the present application with respect to Figs. 1A and 1B, the reception FIFO circuit 110 is under read/write control and parity data control of FIFO controller 106. Reception FIFO circuit 110 is adapted to receive data 108a from shift register 108, one byte at a time, for temporarily buffering the data. As further described in paragraph [0031], FIFO controller 106 is adapted to check, upon receiving parity data, the state of FIFO circuits 104 and 110, and based on the result

**control interrupts.** As further described in paragraph [0036], reception trigger detector 114b in trigger detector 114 includes a reception trigger register (RxTRG) 14b, whereby reception trigger detector 114b detects a trigger based on a received write count signal 28 and a read count signal 30, and outputs the trigger detection signal to the internal interrupt circuit 118 as the interrupt output control signal 114c.

Applicants respectfully submit that the specification at least as noted above describes interrupt control of reception FIFO circuit 110, in connection with reception trigger detector 114b and internal interrupt circuit 118 in Figs. 1A and 1B. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the specification reasonably conveys possession of the claimed invention, and that claim 25 is therefore in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for at least the above reasons. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection for at least these reasons.

#### **Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 103**

Claim 24 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Moore et al. reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,378,011), in view of the Firoozmand reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,210,749). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The communication terminal of claim 24 includes in combination a trigger detector connected to the second data bus and comprising a transmission trigger detector and a reception trigger detector, "said transmission trigger detector counting an

input of the first read count signal to generate a first count value, and outputting a first interrupt output control signal when the first count value is equal to a first predetermined value indicating a remaining data amount, said reception trigger detector counting an input of the second read count signal to generate a second count value, and outputting a second interrupt output control signal when the second count value is equal to a second predetermined value indicating a remaining data output". Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art as relied upon by the Examiner does not disclose or make obvious these features.

On page 3 of the current Office Action dated September 8, 2005, the Examiner has alleged that ASD Tx FIFO fill level register (ATFFL) 151 as described in column 6, line 28 of the Moore et al. reference may be interpreted as the transmission trigger detector of claim 24, and that ASD Rx FIFO fill level register (ARFFL) 161 as described in column 7, lines 21-22 of the Moore et al. reference may be interpreted as the reception trigger detector of claim 24. Near the bottom of page 3 of the current Office Action, the Examiner has further asserted that column 4, lines 35-38 of the Moore et al. reference may be interpreted as disclosing transmission and reception trigger detectors (ATFFL and ARFFL) as outputting interrupt output control signals when a count value is equal to predetermined values indicating a remaining data amount. Applicants respectfully disagree for the following reasons.

Particularly, column 6, line 28 of the Moore et al. reference merely describes that FIFO fill level register (ATFFL) 151 is incremented by ASD register module 101

following a single parallel write from the DSP to ASD register module 101. FIFO fill level register (ATFFL) 151 is not described in the Moore et al. reference as outputting a first interrupt output control signal when a first count value is equal to a first predetermined value indicating a remaining data amount, as would be necessary to meet the features of claim 24. Column 4, lines 35-38 of the Moore et al. reference as further relied upon by the Examiner merely describes a serial data status register (SDSR), and that FIFO thresholds for interrupts are contained in ASD Rx FIFO threshold register (ARFTR) and ASD Tx FIFO threshold register (ATFTR).

Applicants respectfully submit that column 6, line 28 and column 4, lines 35-38 of the Moore et al. reference as specifically relied upon by the Examiner do not describe that FIFO fill level register (ATFFL) 151 (interpreted by the Examiner as the transmission trigger detector of claim 24) outputs a first interrupt output control signal when a count value is equal to a first predetermined value indicating a remaining data amount, as would be necessary to meet the features of claim 24. That is, a first interrupt output control signal, a first predetermined value and a remaining data amount are not specifically described in the above noted relied upon portions of the Moore et al. reference.

Likewise, column 7, lines 21-29 and column 4, lines 35-38 of the Moore et al. reference as specifically relied upon by the Examiner do not disclose or describe that FIFO fill level register (ARFFL) 161 (interpreted by the Examiner as the reception trigger detector of claim 24) outputs a second interrupt output control signal when a second

count value is equal to a second predetermined value indicating a remaining data amount, as would be necessary to meet the further features of claim 24. The Moore et al. reference as relied upon by the Examiner thus fails to meet the features of claim 24. The Firoozmand reference as secondarily relied upon by the Examiner does not overcome these above noted deficiencies. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the communication terminal of claim 24 would not have been obvious in view of the prior art as relied upon by the Examiner taken singularly or together, and that this rejection of claim 24 is improper for at least these reasons.

Claim 25 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Moore et al. reference (and also presumably in consideration of the Firoozmand reference), in further view of the Lewis et al. reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,619,544). Applicants respectfully submit that the Lewis et al. reference as secondarily relied upon does not overcome the above noted deficiencies of the primarily relied upon Moore et al. reference. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 25 would not have been obvious in view of the prior art as relied upon by the Examiner taken singularly or together, and that this rejection of claim 25 is improper for at least these reasons.

### **Conclusion**

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the corresponding rejections, and to pass the claims of the present application to issue, for at least the above reasons.

In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, please contact Andrew J. Telesz, Jr. (Reg. No. 33,581) at (571) 283-0870 in the Washington, D.C. area, to discuss these matters.

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.17 and 1.126(1), the Applicants hereby petition for an extension of one (1) month to January 8, 2006, for the period in which to file a response to the outstanding Office Action. The required fee of \$120.00 should be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0238.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment for any additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0238.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE FRANCOS & WHITT, P.L.L.C.



Andrew J. Telesz, Jr.  
Registration No. 33,581

One Freedom Square  
11951 Freedom Drive, Suite 1260  
Reston, Virginia 20190  
Telephone No.: (571) 283-0720  
Facsimile No.: (571) 283-0740